DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 613 CE 022 186

AUTHOR Crusey, Carolynn
TITLE Career Exploration for Gifted and Talented High School Students. Final Project Performance Report, October 1, 1977 through February 28, 1979.
INSTITUTION Jefferson County Public Schools, Lakewood, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 554AH70530
PUB DATE Mar 79
GRANT G007702785
NOTE 47p.; For related documents see CE 022 187, ED 132 284, and ED 138 786

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Community Involvement; *Experiential Learning; *Gifted; *Internship Programs; Pilot Projects; Program Development; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Colorado (Jefferson County); Education Amendments 1974; *Experience Based Career Education

ABSTRACT

An experience-based career education project for gifted and talented high school students was implemented in three pilot schools in Jefferson County, Colorado. The model was adapted from an existing model, which was designed for the regular school population and based on a prototype model developed by Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. Implementation of the program was relatively smooth during the first pilot term. Emphasis was place on establishing exploration and internship experiences in the community for students. All three high schools involved followed the model closely in terms of recommended staffing, three-hour block scheduling for students, use of transportation, awarding credit, and community site development. Elective credit was granted for career education; academic credit was awarded for individual projects which students negotiated with project teachers as well as cooperating content area teachers. Community instructors also assisted in designing projects which took place at their sites and were involved in the evaluation of these projects before credit was granted. Over 800 community sites were recruited for participation. The decision was made to extend the second term to a full eighteen weeks to allow time for program activities not accomplished in the nine-week term. Presently, administrative procedures are being followed to seek district approval for implementation beyond federal funding due to the positive responses of all those involved. (BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173613

CAREER EXPLORATION FOR GIFTED & TALENTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

FINAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT

March, 1979

PREPARED BY: MS. CAROLYNN CRUSEY, PROJECT SPECIALIST

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 022 186

Jefferson County Public Schools
Career Education
1209 Quail St.
Lakewood, Colorado 80215

This information is submitted in compliance with the U. S. Office of Education guidelines regarding Final Project Performance Reports for projects funded under Sections 402 and 406 of Public Law 93-380.(fiscal year 1977), and covers the period from October 1, 1977 to February 28, 1979.

Project #: 554AH70530
Grant #: G007702785

Project Category: INCREMENTAL

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318, states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, career education projects supported under Sections 402 and 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

THIS REPORT, OR ANY MATERIALS PRESENTED HEREIN, MAY BE REPRODUCED FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES WITHOUT PERMISSION.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a grant or contract from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, points of view or opinions expressed do not necessarily represent policies or positions of the Office of Education.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements. 1

Section I: Project Performance Report. 3

Financial Status Report 5

Major Activities

Objective 1: Operational Model 6

Objective 2: Student Selection 8

Objective 3: Program Operationalization. 14

Objective 4: Evaluation. 18

Objective 5: Formalization of Materials and Processes. . . 20

Objective 6: Dissemination 21

Participant Summary 22

Evaluation. 23

Anticipated Problems and/or Changes 25

Dissemination Activities. 32

Special Activities. 34

Report Abstract 36

Section II: Correspondence and Evaluation (Appendix A-G)

Appendix A: Correspondence Regarding No-Cost Time Extension

Appendix B: Correspondence with Dr. Abraham Tannenbaum Regarding Program Model

Appendix C: Correspondence with Dr. Joseph Renzulli Regarding Student Selection

Appendix D: Minutes from June, 1978 Debriefing

Appendix E: Minutes from March, 1979 Debriefing

Appendix F: Evaluation Plan

Appendix G: Final Evaluation Report

Section III: Teacher Materials (Appendix H-J)

Appendix H: Revised Student Selection Paper

Appendix I: Revised Learning Manager's Guide

Appendix J: Community Resources Procedural Manual

Section IV: Student Materials and Dissemination (Appendix K-M)

Appendix K: Student Handbook

Appendix L: Examples of Student Experiences

Appendix M: Dissemination Brochure

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project staff wishes to express special recognition and thanks to the many individuals who contributed their time and energy to this project. Their valuable contributions are greatly appreciated.

School Staff

Arvada West Senior High

Mr. Paul Phillips, Principal
Mr. George Betts, G/T Coordinator
Mrs. Jolene Knapp, Learning Manager
Mrs. Pattie Beauchamp, Program Aide

Bear Creek Senior High

Dr. Jack Koselak, Principal
Mr. Al Wilder, Assistant Principal
Mr. John Harris, G/T Coordinator
Ms. Laura Rothenfeld, Learning Manager
Mr. Hal Jones, Learning Manager
Mrs. Jackie Villani, Program Aide

Golden Senior High

Mr. Leonard Brundage, Principal
Mrs. Patty Kirby, Learning Manager
Mrs. Diana Beatty, Learning Manager
Mrs. Nan Moorehead, Program Aide

Community Task Force

Victoria Lillie	Reporter: KWGN TV
James Cosby	Staff Engineer: Systems Design Martin Marietta Company
Edward Johnson	Manufacturing Representative Edward Johnson Company

Dr. William Mueller	Head of Department of Metallurgical Engineering: Colorado School of Mines
Joan Brown	Dance Instructor Career Education Center Denver Public Schools
Nolan Brown	District Attorney Jefferson County
John Maberry	Geologist: Program Manager U.S. Geological Survey Denver Federal Center
Gerald Magley	Graphic Artist
Gary Robertson	Photographer
Marilyn Browne	Secretary
Marviline Schlichte	Secretary

Gifted and Talented Staff

Mrs. Joan Wise, Intern
Mrs. Dale Marshall, Secretary

Consultants

Ms. Nancy Anderson, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Mr. Tom Owens, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Dr. Abraham Tannenbaum, Columbia University
Dr. Martin Hamburger, New York University
Dr. Joseph Renzulli, University of Connecticut

Special thanks to Nancy Brown, Linda Doyle, Cherie Lyons, and Terri Smith for their support and assistance.

SECTION I :

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

CAREER EXPLORATION FOR GIFTED & TALENTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

1. Project Number 554AH70530

2. Grant Number: G007702785

3. Nature of Report: Final

4. Project Title: Career Exploration for Gifted and Talented Senior High School Students

5. Period Covered by this Report: September 1, 1977 - February 28, 1979*

6. Category of Project: Incremental

7. Names of Project Directors: Dr. Robert Blum and Mr. Harry Morgan

8. Name and Address of Grantee/Assistance Contractor Institution:

Jefferson County Public Schools, District R-1
Division of Instructional Planning and Development
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, Colorado 80215
Telephone (303) 231-2368

*The original grant period was assigned as October 1, 1977 - September 30, 1978. In August 1978 a "no-cost time extension" was requested and received extending the grant period through February 28, 1979. This report includes activities which took place during the entire funding period with emphasis on those activities and accomplishments taking place during the period of May 1, 1978 - February 28, 1979, the period since the semi-annual report. (See Appendix A for correspondence regarding "No-Cost time extension.")

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

1. FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT: Education Amendments 1974	2. FEDERAL GRANT NO. OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NO.: G 007702785
3. GRANT AND ADDRESS OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATION: Jefferson County School District R-1 1209 Quail Street Lakewood, Colorado 80215	4. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.: 1-846002617-A1
5. GRANTEE ACCOUNT NO. OR IDENTIFYING NO.: 554AH70530	6. FINAL REPORT: [X] YES [ ] NO
7. BASIS OF REPORT: [X] CASH [ ] ACCRUED EXPENDITURES	
8. PROJECT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year): FROM 10 / 01 / 77 TO 02 / 28 / 79	9. REPORT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year): FROM 06 / 30 / 78 TO 02 / 28 / 79

10. STATUS OF FUNDS	PROGRAMS - FUNCTIONS - ACTIVITIES (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	TOTAL
a. Total outlays previously reported	28,859						
b. Total program outlays this period	28,000						
c. LESS: Program income credits	-0-						
d. Net program outlays this period	28,000						
e. Total program outlays to date	56,859						
f. LESS: Non-Federal share of program outlays	-0-						
g. Total Federal share of program outlays	56,859						
h. Total unpaid obligations	-0-						
i. LESS: Non-Federal share of unpaid obligations	-0-						
j. Federal share of unpaid obligations	-0-						
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unpaid obligations	56,859						
l. Total Federal funds authorized	56,859						
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds	-0-						

11. INDIRECT EXPENSE: a. TYPE OF RATE (Mark box)
[ ] PROVISIONAL [ ] FINAL
[ ] PREDETERMINED [X] FIXED

b. RATE: 10%

c. BASE: 51,690

d. TOTAL AMOUNT: 5,169

e. FEDERAL SHARE: 5,169

12. REMARKS (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

APPR: 7570270
FY & CAN 77 2006605

13. Certification - I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purposes set forth in the grant award documents.

NAME AND TITLE	TELEPHONE (AREA CODE / NUMBER / EXT.)	DATE REPORT IS SUBMITTED
Franklin G. Wood Coordinator Special Programs	303 / 231-2363	4/18/79

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

9. MAJOR ACTIVITIES

The following list includes the major accomplishments under each project objective, with reference to the resulting products. A short narrative follows each list describing the accomplishments in further detail.

The project was implemented in the three pilot schools during the Spring Quarter of 1978 (April-June) and again during the Fall Semester of the 1978-79 school year (October-February). The no-cost time extension allowed the opportunity to run the second term for a full 18 weeks, which was the original intent of the project. Thus comparisons can be made between the nine and eighteen week programs, and will be discussed in the Evaluation section.

Objective 1

To design an operational model of career exploration for gifted and talented high school students.

Major Activity	Date Completed	Resulting Product
1. Conduct a planning conference	11/1/77	Minutes in Semi-Annual Report
2. Formalize Operational Model Working Paper	12/12/77	
3. Have Operational Model reviewed by staff and citizens	12/13/77 (staff and citizens)	Minutes in Semi-Annual Report
4. Adjust the model as necessary to incorporate input obtained	1/10/78	
5. Submit Operational Model Working Paper	4/20/78	Model paper in Semi-Annual Report
6. Implement 9-week model in three pilot schools	6/15/78	
7. Conduct a project debriefing including discussion of Operational Model	6/13/78	Minutes from June de-briefing (Appendix D)
8. Adjust Model as necessary to reflect debriefing input	7/1/78	
9. Incorporate Adjusted Model into useful teacher material	9/1/78	Revised Learning Manager's Guide (Appendix I)
10. Incorporate Explanation of Adjusted Model into Dissemination materials	2/28/79	• Descriptive Program Brochure • Articles submitted for publication
11. Have operational model reviewed by external consultant	5/1/79	• Letter from Abraham Tannenbaum (Appendix B)

The first major decision made by project staff was to use the experience based career education model existing in the district as a vehicle for implementation, making necessary adaptations for use with gifted and talented students. The existing model, entitled, Exploring Careers in the Community (ECC), was in the second year of pilot, and meeting success with the regular school population. ECC is itself a district adaptation of a prototype model developed by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) called Experience Based Career Education (EBCE). Staff from NWREL attended the majority of planning meetings involving the adaptation for gifted, providing the necessary technical assistance in the use of the EBCE model.

A working paper was developed for Exploring Careers in the Community for Gifted and Talented students (ECC/GT), outlining the major program objectives and detailing the proposed plans for implementation at the three pilot schools. The contents of the ECC/GT paper were reviewed by consultants, staff and a citizens advisory task force. Feedback was extremely positive, especially in light of the short timeline involved.

Adaptations of the original ECC model for ECC/GT generally centered around re-writing the twelve student objectives to make them appropriate for a gifted population and modifying program strategies and activities to reflect the new emphasis of the objectives. The resulting paper, filed with the semi-annual report, drew careful comparisons between the original model and the ECC/GT model and gave the rationale for the adaptations made for gifted students.

The operational model paper was the major document used in the training sessions for program staff. The contents were eventually incorporated into the "Learning Manager's Guide", a manual provided to all teachers participating in the pilot.

After the 9-week pilot, the program staff participated in a debriefing session in which all the contents of the model were discussed and revised for the second (18 week) pilot conducted, October-February, 1979. At that point, project staff made the decision to incorporate the revisions directly into training materials and the "Learning Manager's Guide" rather than composing a second model paper as an intermediate phase.

Program debriefing strongly indicated the need for an 18 week time frame within which to accomplish the objectives of the ECC/GT model. Revisions for the second pilot term focused on expanding timelines to an 18 week term. This expansion did not involve an addition of activities, as might have been expected, because the original 9-week term was not sufficient time to conduct the activities already outlined in the model. The 18 week pilot became a natural solution to many of the time problems encountered in the 9-week time frame.

Objective 2

To design student selection procedures for gifted and talented high school students entering the career exploration program.

Major Activity	Date Completed	Resulting Products
1. Conduct a planning conference to establish general selection procedures	11/9/77	Minutes in Semi-Annual Report
2. Conduct a review of current literature in the field of gifted education	11/28/77	Summary in first selection working paper (included in semi-annual report)
3. Conduct a local community sample to assist in determining local criteria for selection	11/28/77	Description of Sampling Procedures detailed in selection working paper (included in semi-annual report)

4.	Conduct a second planning meeting to discuss results of community sample	11/29/77	Minutes in semi-annual report
5.	Prepare a selection procedure working paper	12/5/77	
6.	Have working paper reviewed by staff and citizens	12/12/77	Minutes in semi-annual report
7.	Revise paper to incorporate input submit final draft	1/30/78	Included in semi-annual report
8.	Conduct staff training in the use of proposed selection procedures	12/11/78	
9.	Conduct student selection for the first pilot term based on procedures outlined in the selection paper.	3/15/78	
10.	Conduct project debriefing including discussion of student selection procedures	6/13/78	Minutes from June debriefing (Appendix D)
11.	Revise student selection paper to reflect continued research and staff feedback	8/1/78	Revised selection paper (Appendix H)
12.	Conduct student selection using revised procedures	10/1/78	
13.	Incorporate final revisions of selection procedures into district training model	10/1/78	
14.	Review of revised selection paper by external consultant	3/5/79	Reactions from Dr. Joseph Renzulli (Appendix C)

Researching the area of student selection and identification was a major thrust of the project. In the course of the 18 months, two position papers were compiled. The first effort focused upon a review of current research and a sample of the local community to define attributes appropriate as criteria for student selection. The following goals were established at the first planning conference.

- to identify attributes necessary for exceptional career achievement
- to discover which attributes are common and which attributes are unique to different career fields
- to decide which of the above attributes are applicable and appropriate for student selection
- to select existing instruments and/or develop appropriate devices to identify students with these attributes
- to develop the student selection process (time sequence, format, etc.) as it will be used in the school setting
- to place the student selection process into the schools (i.e., train involved personnel--teachers, counselors, administrators, community representatives)
- to adapt student selection procedures for use in identification of community instructors in order to facilitate a compatible student/mentor relationship
- to examine the entire student selection process for its validity in discovering students with career achievement potential

Once the goals were established, the months of November and December 1977 were spent gathering information. The literature search was the major responsibility of the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory (NWREL). The purpose of this aspect of the design was to gather information regarding selection criteria and procedures used in existing programs and current definitions of giftedness and talentedness.

Believing the community to be of value in obtaining attributes necessary for career achievement, a three-phase community survey was done. The first phase involved interviews with a small number (7) of community members for the purpose of gaining a list of descriptors which were synonymous with giftedness and talentedness as these terms applied to particular fields. In the second phase, additional data was gained by an informal group discussion in which community members considered to be exceptional by their peers were asked to share ideas concerning qualities necessary for exceptional career achievement. The third phase involved a large community survey (300) to seek prioritization of responses gained through the community interviews and the community group discussion.

Upon completion of the literature search and community sample, recommendations were made for general selection criteria and identification and selection procedures. The recommendations were presented to teachers, a community advisory task force and educational consultants for review, critique and approval. Based on the research conducted, the Student Selection working paper was prepared.

Detailed information regarding the results of research and the recommended student identification and selection procedures are contained in the first

student selection paper, filed with the semi-annual report. There was only one major deviation from the previously stated goals. This occurred in the area of development of "career specific" criteria for selection. After reviewing the literature and conducting the community surveys, it was decided that to select students into the program or eliminate them from the program based on career specific criteria would be inappropriate. It was determined that all gifted and talented individuals need career exploration regardless of the career field in which their gifts or talents lie.

Further thought lead to the conclusion that career specific criteria should be established for another purpose. Having been selected into the program on the basis of the established criteria, it became important to choose wisely the experiences that were undertaken during the program, since a limited number of explorations were done by each student. Career specific criteria was used as a guidance tool in helping students plan their exploration experiences.

The rationale and procedures detailed in the Selection Paper were used as the basis for training teachers and were implemented for selecting students to participate in the first pilot term.

At the end of the first pilot, teachers participated in "debriefing sessions" which included discussion of the procedures and recommendations for revisions. Concurrently, research was continued and, in addition, the Jefferson County Gifted and Talented Department was formalizing a set of procedures for use in school-centered gifted programs. Finally, formal evaluation data was received which also indicated a need for revision of the procedures.

As a result, a second "Selection Paper" was written which reflected revisions based on the above feedback and an attempt was made to make procedures

for the ECC/GT program compatible with the school-centered G/T selection procedures.

The revised procedures were used for the second pilot term commencing in October 1978. In general, these procedures met with greater success and have now been incorporated into an established district model for use beyond the funding of the project. The final Student Selection Paper is included in Appendix H.

Objective 3

To operationalize ECC/GT program in three pilot high schools.

	Major Activity	Date Completed	Resulting Products
1.	Select School Staffs	11/1/77	
2.	Select Students for 1st pilot term	3/15/78	Screening took place at each school using the procedures outlined in the previous section and detailed in the first Student Selection paper filed in the Semi-annual Report
3.	Train School Staffs	3/31/78	Training schedule filed in Semi-annual Report
4.	Orient Students to Program for 1st pilot term	3/31/78	Orientation materials in Learning Manager's Guide (Appendix I)
5.	Identify and Train Community Instructors	On-going	"CI Handbook" filed in Semi-annual Report
6.	Conduct Program for 1st pilot term	6/10/78	
7.	Conduct Debriefing Session Regarding Program Revision for 2nd term	6/15/78	Debriefing Notes June 12, 13, 1978 (Appendix D)
8.	Examine Evaluation Data for 1st term	7/1/78	"On-site Report" sent in cassette form from Policy Studies
9.	Incorporate debriefing and evaluation feedback into program material revisions	9/30/78	
10.	Train additional teachers	10/6/78	
11.	Conduct 2nd pilot term	2/28/79	
12.	Conduct 2nd term debriefing	3/9/79	Debriefing notes March 8, 9, 1979 (Appendix E)
13.	Seek district approval for for year 3 implementation	in-process	

A highly motivated and dedicated group of personnel was selected for the pilot year staff. Participating teachers were trained in two separate sessions: one 2-day workshop focusing on identification and selection of students, and another 5-day workshop focusing on program delivery. NWREL assisted in the 5-day workshop which was based upon the EBCE model with adaptations for Gifted and Talented students. The EBCE training format was followed and proved to be extremely effective.

A third strand of training involved in-servicing in Gifted and Talented education. Tight timelines resulted in a lack of specific emphasis in this area. However, the 5-day training module described above included basic strategies in Gifted education as they related specifically to the experience-based model. In addition, teachers took it upon themselves to enroll in university courses and also consulted individually with staff members at their buildings who had been involved with school-centered gifted programs.

After the first pilot term, teachers were able to better articulate needs for further training in Gifted education and responded to a needs assessment at that time. During the second pilot term workshops were held in the areas of "Psychological and Counseling Needs of Gifted Students" and "Curriculum Design." Both workshops involved highly experienced consultants: Dr. Abraham Tannenbaum, of Columbia University and Dr. Martin Hamburger, of New York University conducted the workshop on psychological and counseling needs; Ms. Sandra Kaplan of the Leadership Training Institute conducted the workshop on curriculum design.

Operationalization of ECC/GT was relatively smooth during the first pilot term, however it became evident that a 9-week term did not allow enough time to complete all the strategies included in the training module. Emphasis was

placed on establishing exploration and internship experiences in the community for students, thus necessitating lesser emphasis on several other in-school strategies such as employer seminars and guidance activities.

All three high schools involved in the pilot followed the model very closely in terms of recommended staffing, block scheduling for students, use of transportation, awarding credit, and community site development. The program ran for a three hour block of time, which students used for in-class as well as community site experiences. Transportation to sites was provided by school buses, municipal buses and in many cases, family vehicles available to student drivers.

Elective credit was granted for Career Education; academic credit was awarded for individual projects which students completed after negotiations with ECC/GT teachers as well as cooperating content area teachers. Community Instructors also assisted in designing projects which took place at their sites, and were involved in the evaluation of the site-related projects before credit was granted.

Community site development was a function of the central staff. A five member team, funded under a separate state grant, worked for one year to recruit and develop community sites. This team provided services for other career education efforts in the district; ECC/GT was only one of the project served by the team. As a result of their efforts, over 800 sites were recruited for the district, including many sites specifically committed to working with gifted students for the first pilot term.

As mentioned under Objective 1, a debriefing session was held at the end of the first pilot term to discuss directions for program revision. The major decision made was to extend the second term to a full 18-weeks, thus allowing time for many of the program activities which had not been accomplished in the 9-week term.

Detailed debriefing notes are contained in Appendix D of this report. In general, the student objectives were found to be appropriate due to the fact that growth had been observed and indeed measured in the formal evaluation report. Program activities and management were viewed as "on target" in terms of meeting the objectives, especially in light of projections for their use during an 18-week term. Finally, teacher and student materials were reviewed with input from students themselves and suggestions for revisions were made.

During the summer months between the two terms, all revisions and modifications were incorporated into a revised set of teacher and student materials.

During the week prior to the second pilot term, four additional teachers were trained using the five day module described earlier, which had been up-dated to reflect the above mentioned program revisions. Two of the teachers participated in the second pilot term as additions to the existing pilot staffs; two were trained for a non-pilot schools wishing to add the G/T dimension to their existing career education program.

Second term operationalization indeed supported the value of the 18-week timeline, allowing time for those activities which had been de-emphasized during the 9-week term. Teachers and students remained enthusiastic and continued to accomplish program goals with success.

The problems which did arise were minor when compared with the general success of the pilot, however, they will be outlined in section 12 of this report and are described in detail in the second term debriefing notes (Appendix E).

Presently, administrative procedures are being followed to seek district approval for implementation beyond the federal funding. Response has been positive and all those involved in the project are optimistically awaiting final decisions.

IV. Evaluate the ECC/GT Program

Major Activity	Date Completed	Resulting Product
1. Select evaluation contractor	9/30/77	Policy Studies in Education of New York (Director - Dr. Henry Brickell)
2. Design overall evaluation plan	11/1/77	Appendix F
3. Conduct Student Pretests	4/3/78	
4. Evaluate Operational Model	4/3/78	
5. Evaluate Student Selection Procedures	6/10/78	
6. Conduct on-site evaluation	5/30-31/78	Observations included in final evaluation report
7. Conduct Student Post Tests	6/1/78	
8. Evaluate Program Progress	6/10/78	Appendix D (Debriefing Notes)
9. Revise program components based upon feedback from on-site evaluation, review program documents by external consultants and program debriefing	9/30/78	
10. Pre-test students using NWREL testing	10/8/78	
11. Post-test students using NWREL testing	3/1/79	
12. Evaluate 2nd term progress	3/16/79	Append[illegible] (Debriefing Notes)
13. Receipt of final evaluation report	3/30/79	See evaluation (Section II)

Policy Studies in Education (PSE), New York, was selected as the third party evaluator for this project. As their report discusses (See Appendix G), PSE used a combination of instruments including questionnaires, standardized tests and on-site interviews. The report details the rationale for selection of the instruments as well as an evaluation of their effectiveness. It should be noted that Policy Studies used several questionnaires developed by NWREL for use in programs using the EBCE prototype. During the planning meetings regarding evaluation, NWREL agreed to collect data resulting from the use of their questionnaires and to send the compiled data to Policy Studies for use in the final evaluation report. The report carefully sites those contributions of NWREL as well as other standardized testing and data collected exclusively by Policy Studies.

Feedback in addition to third party evaluation was obtained in the form of reviews by consultants and program debriefing. As mentioned earlier, Dr. Abraham Tannenbaum, a leader in the field of Gifted Education, reviewed the operational model, Dr. Joseph Renzulli, highly recognized for significant contributions in the field of student selection, reviewed the student selection procedures (See Appendices B and C).

Program debriefings after both pilot terms, June 1978 and March, 1979, proved extremely helpful in gathering teacher and student feedback in a less formal context than the formal evaluation.

All formal and informal feedback was considered carefully in making program revisions prior to the second term, and this information continues to be useful as the project anticipates district approval and implementation.

V. Formalize Materials and Processes for the ECC/GT Program

Major Activity	Date Completed	Resulting Products
1. File Student Selection working paper	2/15/78	Submitted in Semi-Annual Report
2. File Operational Model working paper	4/20/78	Submitted in Semi-Annual Report
3. Prepare first draft of student materials	4/10/78	Submitted in Semi-Annual Report
4. Prepare staff training materials	4/10/78	Submitted in Semi-Annual Report
5. Revise all program materials and processes based on formal and informal evaluation received.	9/30/78	
6. Edit, design layout and duplicate all program materials,		Revised Student Selection Paper (Appendix H) Revised Learning Manager's Guide (Appendix I) Revised Student Handbook (Appendix K) Revised Community Resources Procedural Manual (Appendix J)

The no-cost time extension allowed the opportunity to seek careful critique of all printed material including procedural documents and student/teacher materials. Major revisions were conducted through the summer months between the two pilot terms. All materials were formalized for use during the second pilot term and are available for use throughout the district. In addition, copies of all materials are available for dissemination to other institutions on a cost-recovery basis.

VI. Disseminate ECC/GT Project Information

Major Activity	Date Completed	Resulting Products
1. Prepare and duplicate brochure describing project	4/20/78	Submitted in Semi-Annual Report
2. Disseminate Brochure	Ongoing	
3. Produce slide/tape Presentation	8/1/78	Slide/Tape available from career education office, Jeffco Schools
4. Present slide/tape and program information to various groups interested in ECC/GT program.	Ongoing	A detailed list of presentations included in dissemination section of this report (Section 13).
5. Prepare and duplicate final dissemination brochure	5/1/79	Appendix M

Specific information regarding dissemination efforts is included in Section 13. In general, dissemination efforts were concentrated during the second phase of the project, after the first term had been conducted. Prior to that time, a brochure which outlined the intent of the project and was disseminated to all interested parents, students, district personnel, community members and requesting parties outside the district. After the first pilot term, a slide/tape program was produced, documenting the program as it existed during the first pilot term. Finally, due to many requests for a condensed description of program procedures, a second brochure was prepared describing the formalized operations and the results of the two pilot terms. This brochure is found in Appendix M.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

NOTE. Participants include those DIRECTLY served by the project or, in the case of most parents and persons in the business/labor/industry community, who actively assist in project implementation. "Actively assist" includes efforts such as serving as resource persons, serving on Advisory Groups, providing work experience, etc.

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51-R1187

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (see NOTE above) WHO ARE	RACE/ETHNICITY (all Participants including Handicapped, Gifted and Talented, and Low Income)						OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE			OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE	
	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE (1)	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER (2)	BLACK/ NEGRO (3)	CAUCASIAN/ WHITE (4)	HISPANIC (5)	TOTAL (sum of columns (1) through (5)) (6)	HANDICAPPED (7)	GIFTED AND TALENTED (8)	LOW INCOME (9)	MALE (10)	FEMALE (11)
STUDENTS											
ELEMENTARY (K-6)											
MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH (7-9)											
SENIOR HIGH (10-12)	--	1	1	87	--	89	--	89	--	49	40
2-YEAR COLLEGE											
4-YEAR COLLEGE											
ADULTS (non-matriculated)											
SUB-TOTAL	--	1	1	87	--	89	--	89	--	49	40
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL											
TEACHERS						7					
COUNSELORS						3					
ADMINISTRATORS						3					
MEMBERS OF THE BUSINESS/ LABOR/INDUSTRY COMMUNITY						Approx. 250					
PARENTS						Approx. 40					
OTHER (specify) Library Media Spec.						3					
TOTAL						395					

OE FORM 467, 2/76

11. EVALUATION

An evaluation plan was developed by November of the project year and included, by objective, the type of measurement to be used, responsibilities of the external evaluator and project staff, and the instrumentation to measure attainment of learner outcomes and project objectives. A copy of the detailed evaluation plan is included in Appendix F of this report.

Policy Studies in Education (PSE), New York was selected as the third party evaluator for this project. As their report discusses (See Appendix G), PSE used a combination of instruments including questionnaires, standardized tests and on-site interviews. The report details the rational for selection of the instruments as well as an evaluation of their effectiveness. It should be noted that Policy Studies used several questionnaires developed by NWREL for use in programs using the EBCE prototype. During the planning meetings regarding evaluation, NWREL agreed to collect data resulting from the use of their questionnaires and to send the compiled data to Policy Studies for use in the final evaluation report. The report carefully sites those contributions of NWREL as well as other standardized testing and data collected exclusively by Policy Studies.

The following chart lists the pre and post test instruments used for measuring both cognitive and attitudinal growth among students and opinions of the various adult populations associated with the project:

Pre-Tests	Post-Tests
Student Attitude Questionnaire (SAQ) - ECC/GT and control group	SAQ - ECC/GT and control
Student Background Questionnaire (SBQ) - ECC/GT and control	Staff Questionnaire
Student Baseline Data (Including Grade Point Average and current grade level) - ECC/GT and control	Parent Questionnaire
	Community Instructor Questionnaire
	CTBS (All subjects except Reading, Vocabulary and Spelling) - ECC/GT and control
	APL - ECC/GT and control
	College Board: Career Skills Assessment (3 subjects) - ECC/GT and control
	Field-based test instrument - ECC/GT and control *

* Trained observers composed test questions based on additional learning observed during the program

Two on-site visitations were conducted by the external evaluator, one in March, 1978 to discuss planned implementation with project staff, and one in May, 1978 to interview students, staff, and community instructors involved with the project.

Evaluation design, instruments used, testing results and an analysis of project success are included in the Final Evaluation Report, Appendix G . A rough draft of this report, including the site visit report, was forwarded to project staff during the summer months of 1978 for use in making revisions for the second pilot term. The formal report was completed and mailed to project staff in March, 1979.

An additional source of formative data was collected during project debriefings by project staff. Debriefings were conducted at the end of each pilot term, June, 1978 and March, 1979. Present at the debriefings were pilot teachers, representative students and central project staff. This form of informal formative evaluation proved extremely useful for making program revisions for the second pilot term. Decisions made during debriefing sessions were supported substantially by the findings of the Final Evaluation Report. The major recommendation included in both the debriefing documentation and the Final Evaluation Report was to extend the length of the program to a full 18-week session. This was accomplished in the second pilot term of the program with successful results. The second debriefing also supported the effectiveness of the program materials and procedural revisions implemented during the second 18 week term. Notes from debriefings are included in Appendices D and E.

12. ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS AND/OR CHANGES

The no-cost time extension which allowed for a second pilot term gave project staff the opportunity to find solutions to many of the problems noted in the semi-annual report. Several problematic areas do remain, however, and district staff are working to find remedies before full district implementation is reached.

Student Outcomes

It was generally agreed that the student outcomes were realistic and that growth had been observed in all of them. The following two objectives (of the total 12 objectives) are still causing some concern:

- Students will distinguish those thinking skills appropriate in a given situation and improve their ability to use higher level thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation).
- Students will investigate career-related situations and use the decision-making process to produce an outcome which is original to the student and acceptable to the field. The decision-making process will emphasize creative alternative solutions. (Divergent Production).

There is still concern that the higher level thinking skills have not been integrated significantly enough into all of the activities and materials. Part of this problem rests in the fact that there is very little material developed commercially or locally with the emphasis on Higher Level Thinking skills. Now that this need is seen more clearly, work is underway to gather and/or create more material with this emphasis.

A second area of concern in the area of student outcomes deals with "Divergent Production." Although difficult to define, the majority of teachers feel it is a worthy outcome to address; however, there remain questions as to

the relative success students experience in meeting this outcome. This is due in recent analysis to the choice of career field and the degree of previous background knowledge a student holds. It was previously assumed that a student's lack of success in dealing with this objective was dependent upon the degree of creative problem-solving and productivity a student possessed. Although this may still be a factor, many staff are turning to a belief that certain career fields lend themselves better to the divergent production objective than others.

It is probably not a coincidence that the two most problematic areas in dealing with effective student outcomes are those directly related to efforts to target the curriculum for Gifted and Talented Students. On one hand it could be assumed that the original EBCE model with its concentration on individualized learning, could, in and of itself, meet the needs of gifted students. However, those involved with planning and development were not satisfied with this assumption and therefore directed efforts toward refining the curriculum to emphasize these G/T outcomes. The outcomes of Higher Level Thinking and Divergent Production deal specifically with such an emphasis. One explanation for the remaining concerns in dealing with these outcomes is that teachers and students are dealing with these outcomes for the first time in their own experience and are particularly critical of their own efforts to achieve success through the use of these outcomes.

Community Instructor Identification and Training

Location of community sites has been a major task of the central staff. A "bank" of sites was pre-recruited in order to have an adequate supply for program "start-up." This bank has been helpful in providing sites for explorations. However, due to the uniqueness and specificity of internship site requirements, location of these sites generally remains a task for students and teachers to tackle once areas of interest are clarified through exploration.

Many times a student is able to locate an internship on his/her own, either through personal contacts or avenues pursued during exploration. This task is sometimes frustrating for students and teachers, alike, as deadlines approach.

Appropriate training for Community Instructors (CI's) remains an area of concern. The lact of proper contact with Community Instructors is mainly a time problem. It was pointed out that many Community Instructors do not feel there has been enough communication with school personnel. However, the school personnel do not feel they have the time to do an adequate job in this area. Suggestions were given for partially solving this problem:

- A once-a-month open invitation for CI's to visit with school personnel
- A local school CI advisory council which could assist by providing a communication network.
- Working through organizations such as Association of Commerce and Industry for communication and location of further contacts.
- Use of short communications, such as "appreciation certificates," thank-yous in school newsletters, etc.
- Thank-you lunches or dinners with students and CI's.

Aide Time

Due to project funding, all school programs staffed a four-hour lay assistant. The lay assistants were generally involved with scheduling student appointments with Learning Managers and community sites and providing necessary clerical assistance to the Learning Managers. The program lay assistants were unanimously considered a major key to the success of the program. Presently, since project funding has ended, the individual schools are negotiating with administrators to maintain lay-help for their programs.

Transportation

Transportation is still a problem with the added information regarding district policy on "Students as Drivers for Other Students." District policy

states that students under 18 must not drive with other students under 18 to school-related activities. In most cases, students are forced by this policy to drive alone to sites or arrange rides through the municipal bus system, volunteer parents or school-dispatched buses.

Local Building Rapport

Staff relationships within each building are still delicate in some cases. Teachers sited the fact that funding required quick implementation of a pilot which prevented a slower building of rapport with other staff members. In some cases this resulted in suspicion and alienation on the part of other school staff.

The general effort toward building staff rapport is guided by the assumption that this program needs to be accurately described and must find a comfortable "fit" into the total building curriculum. Every effort is being pursued toward this goal in each building.

Student Selection

There is still agreement that the selection process is necessary. A strong need exists to appropriately raise school staff, parent and student awareness regarding a "gifted and talented" definition and program philosophy. This is at times a delicate issue, and yet essential if nomination and selection are to be accurate and meaningful. As the district comes closer to a unified approach in this area of "awareness", there is optimism that individual school procedures for selection will be accomplished more smoothly.

The second year's selection procedures came much closer to the total district approach to selection of "gifted and talented". Similar selection criteria and measurement hopefully assures that similar populations are identified from school to school. Several schools made a conscious effort to differentiate between students who they determined to be gifted according to definition and measurement and those with high potential who could benefit from a career program.

As many students as possible were selected for program participation. The "gifted" label was consciously avoided until the students could show further qualification through participation in program activities. Even then the "label" was only attached for transcript purposes, if the student wished such a designation on his/her transcript and in the opinion of the staff demonstrated evidence of giftedness/talentedness during program participation.

There is still a feeling that procedure could be even further streamlined. Some suggestions were:

- Involve more trained staff members so the burden does not fall on a small group. (This also has obvious implications for heightened staff support and awareness).
- Find ways to cut down on the paper work (key punch the standardized items and computerize data collection).

Discontent remains over intelligence testing (Otis Lennon Mental Abilities Test) and the Renzulli/Hartmann Scales for rating characteristics of superior students. Opinions on intelligence testing varied from school to school. Some see its necessity as a check and balance on a more subjective measurement and others still view it as unnecessary and/or misguided. One school is currently compiling results from a study which they pursued, comparing student selection using Otis Lennon versus selection without Otis Lennon. The group reached a consensus that the issue will probably never be completely resolved due to personal philosophies. However, there was agreement that procedures should be standardized from school to school. Therefore, a district stance on use of Otis Lennon or any intelligence testing should be made clear if possible.

The Renzulli Scales were also viewed differently from school to school. Some schools find them to be cumbersome, easily misunderstood and, in some cases, prone to biased response. Others find them useful as input from parents and other staff familiar with the student.

It was pointed out that some of the problems with the use of the Scales might stem from lack of proper introduction and instruction in the use of the forms before parents and teachers fill them out. However, it was recognized as a time consuming process by all.

Also, it should be mentioned that the group was in favor of some form of input from parents and other teachers; however, no one is aware of a valid substitute for the Renzulli/Hartman Scales at present.

Operation Beyond Funding

Two of the three high schools are planning to operate beyond funding. This is partly due to the fact that both schools have a larger G/T pilot operation. There is also administrative support for such a program at these schools.

One school is in an unsure posture. The program has strong administrative support and an existing career education program, but, at present, no large G/T program within which to operate.

This brings up the phenomenon that the two schools with gifted pilots are in a better position to support the ECC/GT option than a school with a regular Career Education pilot. It is too soon to make any generalizations based upon only three schools; however, it is a phenomenon to consider.

Paradoxically, one school found a large enough need among non-gifted students that they are also planning to offer a regular Career Education program available to a wider population.

It is also important to mention that so far two schools offering Career Education outside the original ECC/GT pilot are considering the addition of a G/T component to their programs in order to begin meeting the needs of gifted students in their building.

The only conclusion that can be drawn from this evidence is that the combination of gifted/talented education and career education in some form

seems to apply to a variety of situations.

The major concerns in operation beyond funding are twofold:

1) The programs don't feel they can operate very effectively without lay help.

2) The programs are concerned about continued site recruitment, scheduling for student at sites, and maintenance of sites.

These issues are both related because the lay assistants provided major support for item 2. These issues can be more easily answered when the District commits to further program support and when pilot information has been studied.

13. DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Three major documents were prepared for dissemination purposes: An initial brochure describing the intent of the project, a slide/tape program documenting the first pilot term, and a summary brochure describing the formalized processes and the results of the pilot program. In addition, all student materials and procedural papers, including the Student Selection Paper, Community Resource Procedural Manual and the Learning Manager's Guide are used to support the brochures and slide/tape if more detail is requested. The following is a list of the presentations made by project staff with the use of the above mentioned documents.

- Workshop at the Regional Language Arts Society Conference, March 10-12, 1978. (Colorado Springs, Colorado)
- Exhibit at the Council for Exceptional Children Conference, May 2-5, 1978 (Kansas City, Missouri)
- Participation at the "Arts and the Gifted" Conference, June 6-10, 1978 (Aspen, Colorado)
- Presentation at the National "Call for Papers" Conference conducted by the Council on Exceptional Children, February 7-9, 1979 (St. Louis, Missouri)
- Presentation at the National EBCE Conference, February 19-21, 1979 (San Antonio, Texas)
- Presentation at a Career Education Seminar Series at the National Council of the Teachers of English Conference, February 23-24 (Colorado Springs, Colorado)
- Local presentations at the University of Colorado and the University of Denver.
- Consultation as part of Colorado State Career Education dissemination efforts (staff members are members of a state resource team).

In addition, project staff is presently writing an article about the project which will be submitted to various publications including: The Phi Delta Kappan, The Gifted Child Quarterly, and other appropriate publications.

Copies of all project materials, with the exception of the slide/tape program, are available, upon request, from Jefferson County Public Schools, Career Education Department.

14. SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

At the end of the second pilot term, participating students from both pilot years were invited to attend a special workshop. Students had the major responsibility for planning the activities, which focused upon comparing career field experiences, discussing the label of "gifted and talented" and exploring the concept of creativity. The workshop proved to be a fine culminating activity, allowing students from diverse fields of interest to share ideas and reflect upon the benefits of the program.

In addition, early in the pilot, team leaders from each pilot school were invited to attend a two-day workshop presented to Career Education staff regarding non-traditional roles and the reduction of sex-role stereotyping. An agenda for the workshop follows.

SEX-FAIR CAREER GUIDANCE WORKSHOP

EXPLORING CAREERS IN THE COMMUNITY
PROJECT ON NON-TRADITIONAL CAREER EXPLORATIONS

Old Heidelberg Inn
Highway 40, Golden

Wednesday, February 15, 1978
Thursday, February 16, 1978
8:30 - 4:00

A G E N D A

8:30 - 9:00	Introductions	Dr. Robert Blum Career Education
9:00 - 9:30	Project Pretest	Ms. Linda Doyle Career Education
9:30 - 10:15	Large Group Activity: Exploring Sex-Roles	Ms. Cherie Lyons Career Education Ms. Linda Doyle
10:15 - 10:30	Break	
10:30 - 11:00	Guest Speaker Presentation: Changing Realities: Social, Legal and Economic Aspects	Dr. Martha Fair Colorado Department of Education
11:00 - 12:15	Small Group Activities: Identifying Sex-Bias in Career-Related Materials Large Group Discussion	Dr. Nancy Scott Institute for Equality in Education Ms. Linda Doyle
12:15 - 1:00	Luncheon	
1:00 - 2:30	Practicing Sex-Fair Counseling Techniques: Introduction Demonstration Small Group Role-Plays Large Group Discussion	Dr. Nancy Scott
2:30 - 2:45	Break	
2:45 - 3:15	Utilizing Non-Traditional Community Resources and Individualized Activities in the ECC Program	Mr. Mike Patterson Ms. Elena Newton Community Resources Specialists Selected ECC Team Leaders
3:15 - 3:30	Workshop Evaluation	Ms. Linda Doyle
3:30 - 4:00	Questions, Wrap-up	

15. REPORT ABSTRACT

Introduction and Objectives

The 1977-79 project, "Career Exploration for Gifted and Talented Senior High School Students," was funded by the U.S. Office of Career Education (Grant #G007702785) and conducted jointly by two departments of Jefferson County Public Schools: The Career Education Department and the Gifted and Talented Department. The funding period for the grant was October 1, 1977 through February 28, 1979. A no cost time extension allowed for an additional five months beyond the one-year grant period.

The major goals of this project were:

- To develop curriculum materials and learning activities at levels necessary for gifted and talented students.
- To design appropriate program selection procedures for gifted and talented students.
- To prepare and deliver staff inservice in the areas of career education and gifted and talented education.
- To implement the program with students.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the selection procedures, instructional program, the inservice program, and all project activities.
- To disseminate information about the project, including selection procedures, materials, learning activities, and evaluation results through local, state, and federal avenues.

The vehicle for accomplishing these goals was Jefferson County's existing Exploring Careers in the Community (ECC) Program. ECC is a community based career education program which has already been meeting success with the regular school population for several years.

I. Project Participants

Participants directly served by the project included approximately 89 students, grades 10-12, 6 teachers, counselors, library media specialists and administrators, and more than 250 members of the local community (including

parents) who served as resource persons and community instructors for career exploration experiences. The racial/ethnic background of students was approximately: Caucasian (97.7%), Hispanic (0%), Asian (1.1%), Black (1.1%), and native American (0%). The number of male students was 49 and female students was 40. The project was conducted on a pilot basis in three senior high schools. Two pilot terms were conducted during the 18 month period. The first ran for 9-weeks (April - June, 1978) and the second ran for 18-weeks (October - February, 1978-79).

II. Major Activities

Development of Operational Model. A working paper was developed for Exploring Careers in the Community for Gifted and Talented Students (ECC/GT), outlining the major program objectives and detailing the proposed plans for implementation at the 3 pilot schools. The contents of the paper were reviewed by consultants, staff and a citizens advisory task force. This paper was the major document used in training sessions for program staff and the contents were eventually incorporated into the Learning Manager's Guide, a manual provided to all teachers participating in the program.

The paper included 12 student learning objectives, suggested teaching strategies to meet the objectives, suggested time frames, recommended use of facilities, transportation, and above all suggested use of the community as a major resource for learning.

Development of Student Selection Procedures. Researching the area of student selection and identification was a major thrust of the project. During the 18 months of the project, 2 position papers were compiled. The first effort focused upon a review of current literature and a sample of the local community to define attributes appropriate as criteria for student selection. After this phase was completed, recommendations were made for

general selection criteria, and identification procedures to be followed by the 3 pilot schools. These recommendations were presented to consultants, staff, and the citizens advisory task force for review,critique and approval.

A student selection paper was prepared based on the above recommendations and used as a training document for teachers to use in selection and identification of students. These procedures were followed by the three participating schools during the first pilot term.

A second paper was prepared for use during the second pilot term. This paper reflected revisions based on continued research, needs for standardization with other county G/T programs, and feedback from staff who used the procedures during the first pilot term. The revised procedures were used for the second pilot term and met with greater success. As a result, the procedures have been incorporated into an established district model for use beyond the funding of the project.

Implementation of the Program

Prior to implementation, project teachers were trained in both the areas of Career Education and Gifted Education. A five-day workshop was conducted which focused on program delivery as described in the operational model. In addition, several shorter workshops were held to address specific elements of Gifted Education such as "Student Selection", "Psychological and Counseling Needs", and "Curriculum Design".

Two pilot terms were conducted; one ran nine weeks (April - June, 1978), and one ran eighteen weeks (October - February, 1978-1979). Elective credit was granted for Career Education; academic credit was awarded for individual projects which students completed after negotiations with ECC/GT teachers and cooperating content area teachers. Community Instructors also assisted in

designing projects which took place at their sites, and were involved in the evaluation of site-related projects before credit was granted.

Second term operationalization supported the value of the eighteen week time frame, allowing time for those activities which had to be de-emphasized during the nine week term.

Presently, administrative procedures are being followed to seek district approval for implementation beyond the federal funding. Response has been positive and all those involved in the project are optimistically awaiting final decisions.

Evaluation

Policy Studies in Education (PSE), New York, served as the third party evaluator for the project. PSE used a combination of instruments including questionnaires, standardized tests and on-site interviews. Summative evaluation findings included the following information:

The majority of students involved in the Project were able to accomplish the following goals:

- understanding of a specific career which might be of interest to the student in the future;
- identification of pros and cons of a specific career being explored;
- clarification of personal career goals;
- development of independence on the part of the student;
- improvement in communication skills, particularly verbal skills;
- understanding of the importance of written communication skills in virtually all careers; and
- development of interpersonal skills.

When students were asked about the Project -- both in face-to-face interviews and by questionnaire -- they commented that their experiences in ECC/GT had been most helpful to them in:

- teaching them how to match their interests and abilities to potential careers;
- teaching them what to look for when considering a job;
- teaching them what level of basic skills proficiency would be required for a job of interest to them;
- making them more self-assured when dealing with adults, particularly in a working situation; and
- giving them valuable employability skills, particularly job getting skills such as knowing how to conduct themselves during job interviews and presenting themselves well on the telephone with prospective employers.

Finally, many students commented that the Project gave them a sense of belonging to a group, which they had not previously had in school. Students explained that it was not fashionable to be considered "a brain" or "gifted and talented" and that they now had a peer group which could give them the moral support they needed, especially when working through problems they encountered during their internships or explorations in the community.

Several of the learning managers testified that one of the biggest strengths of the Project was that it enabled students to take responsibility for their own learning -- something which gifted and talented students should be challenged to do -- given the individualized nature of the Project. The learning managers also felt that students were able to make a connection between the knowledge and skills they learned in school and the knowledge and skills they needed on the job -- an important connection for all students to be able to make.

Formalization of Materials and Processes

The following student and teacher materials were formalized during the project and are available for use throughout the district and by other interested institutions: A Student Handbook, A Learning Manager's Guide, A Student Selection Procedural Manual, and a Community Resource Procedural Manual.

Dissemination

Two brochures were designed during the project. The first was prepared to describe the intent of the project and was distributed to other career education programs, state coordinators, interested parents and school personnel, and other requesting parties. This brochure was also used in the recruitment of community sites for the program. A second brochure was developed after the pilot terms, describing formalized operations and the results of the two pilot terms.

A slide-tape was also produced, and has been used widely in presentations to large groups such as the National Experience Based Career Education Conference and The Council on Exceptional Children.

The Final Project Performance Report including all formalized documents and the Final Evaluation Report is available upon request from Jefferson County Public Schools, Career Education Department, 1209 Quail Street, Lakewood, Colorado 80215 (303) 231-2369.